

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, MARCH 8, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer: Micah 6: 8: *He hath showed thee, O man, what is good, and what doth the Lord, thy God, require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?*

Eternal and ever-gracious God, we have entered upon this Lenten season, earnestly beseeching Thee that every thought of our mind may be brought into captivity to the mind of Christ.

Grant that in this time of self-denial and self-examination we may resolve to surrender ourselves more completely to Thy divine will and serve humanity more eagerly.

We penitently confess that we often are disobedient to what Thou dost require of us and that there is still so much selfishness in our hearts, for we live and labor as if our own success and security are the blessings and achievements of supreme worth and enduring value.

Help us to hasten the dawning of that glorious day of prediction when every knee shall bow before Thee and every tongue confess that the Christ is the Lord to the glory of God.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

THE GRIFFIN AMENDMENT TO THE EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION BILL WILL PREVENT MUCH REAL HELP TO EDUCATIONAL TV STATIONS AND SHOULD BE DEFEATED IN CONFERENCE

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday when the educational television bill—H.R. 132—was adopted, we had an amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN]. At the time the gentleman from Michigan said that his amendment would not eliminate from the provisions of the bill any organization which was presently operating an educational television station.

Mr. Speaker, I have studied the matter carefully since yesterday, and have checked its direct effect in my own community of Schenectady where we have

one of the real pioneers in educational television, the Mohawk Hudson Council on Educational Television. Under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, no agency may get any assistance from the Federal Government unless it is composed exclusively of bona fide educational institutions. This great council which has been a pioneer in educational television in upstate New York is composed of 125 agencies, most of them bona fide schools. But also included in this council are such civic organizations as the American Association of University Women, the local chapter of the American Cancer Institute, and the Capital District Association for Nose and Throat Health.

Thus under the provisions of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, the Mohawk Hudson Council would not qualify for help. I know a similar situation prevails in almost every other educational television council in New York State.

What a mockery, Mr. Speaker, to pass a bill designed to help educational television agencies and then exclude from its provisions those very agencies which are most genuinely interested in promoting it, and which have worked hardest for it. Therefore I urge the House and Senate conferees to strike from the bill this unfortunate amendment, which can do so much harm to New York State, especially at a time when the State administration itself is cutting back on its own support for educational television and when Federal help is thus even more essential.

REPORT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1961—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 13, Public Law 806, 80th Congress; I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 8, 1962.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 31]		
Addonizio	Garland	Powell
Andrews	Glenn	Rains
Avery	Gray	Rousselot
Balley	Harrison, Va.	Selden
Barry	Hoffman, Mich.	Sheppard
Bennett, Mich.	Hollifield	Smith, Miss.
Chelf	Hosmer	Steed
Coad	Kornegay	Ullman
Colmer	McIntire	Whitten
Cooley	Meador	Wright
Dent	Moeller	Younger

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall, 400 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight Saturday to file a report on H.R. 8916.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INCREASING THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND REDISTRICTING CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution—House Resolution 557—providing for the consideration of H.R. 10264, a bill to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 438 Members beginning with the 88th Congress, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10264) to provide that the House of Rep-

representatives shall be composed of four hundred and thirty-eight Members beginning with the Eighty-eighth Congress. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto for final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use, and at the conclusion of my remarks I yield one-half hour to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. Sr. GEORGE].

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for an open rule providing 1 hour of general debate and amendment of the bill under the 5-minute rule. I know the Members are all aware of the nature of this legislation and what it means to many Members of Congress. As I stand here I know that I am personally affected as a Member from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, because under the new apportionment resulting from the 1960 census we were cut from 14 Members of Congress to 12. I am also aware, as I know you are, that we are affected because of the fact that we have one party in control of the legislature with a Governor of the opposite party. You may ask: Why do you not go back to your State and clean up your own problem? We are not asking on the basis of the fact that you have an opportunity to help some of your fellow Congressmen; you are always helping your constituents or asking Members of Congress to help you along with legislation. Now you have an opportunity to help a group of Members who are here and need your assistance.

We are asking for this bill purely on the history of such legislation in this Congress.

In the year 1840 there were 31 States in the Union and there were 232 Members of the House of Representatives, and the membership was increased in 1850 to 237. In the next decade new States came into the Union and the membership was increased in 1860 to 243.

In 1870 there were 38 States in the Union. The membership was increased to 293.

By 1880 the membership of Congress was increased to 332, due to the admittance of several States.

In 1890 the membership was increased to 357, due to the admittance of several more States having come into the Union.

In 1900 the number was increased to 391, here again was the admittance of new States.

In 1910 there were 48 States which had been admitted into the Union, the membership was increased to 435.

So for 120 years it has always been the custom of this Congress when new States were admitted to statehood to increase the membership of the House of Representatives.

There are those who say it is unwieldy. Let me ask, is it unwieldy to have more Members of Congress because for the past 2 years we have had seated in this House 437 Congressmen, including one from Hawaii and one from Alaska. Under the 1960 census Hawaii will be entitled to two Congressmen.

When this legislation was passed through the years, it was never the intent of the fathers who sat in the Congress in those days to deny the right of the seating Congressmen. They always made the recommendation and they always increased the number.

Referring to the Senate of the United States, that body automatically by the Constitution has increased its membership four Senators. There are Members who say that they do not think the number should be increased beyond 438. For 60 of the 170 years of this august body there was an even number of Members in the Congress, and I never heard in that history of anything ever happening differently.

I believe that this is a good bill. The purpose of the bill is stated in the report, as follows:

The purpose of the bill is to prevent the recent admission to the Union of the States of Alaska and Hawaii from having the effect of reducing the number of Representatives in Congress shared by the original 48 States below the number to which those States have been entitled over the past half century.

I have explained to you the situation as it exists in Massachusetts. Under this bill there are three States that would benefit. Massachusetts would lose one seat instead of two. Pennsylvania would gain one seat, Missouri would gain one seat.

I feel sorry for those two States that are just over the line that are losing seats.

When our late beloved and dear Speaker, Sam Rayburn, became sick, he had intended and he told the Members of Congress he was going to increase the membership by three or increase it by four, and he wanted the level to stop there.

I have spoken to Members and I have asked them on a personal basis to go along with this legislation. One fellow asked, "What does it do for my State?" Actually it does nothing for his State, and I feel sorry that it does nothing for his State, but in his State he would have to increase the number by 25 Members in order to help. Now, because nothing is going to be done for his State, is he going to disregard the pattern that the Congress has followed throughout all the years? Because he cannot get an increase himself, is he going to sacrifice the other Congressmen from these three States.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the rule will be adopted, and trust the bill will pass.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation has been very ably explained. The rule that comes to us today is an open rule, which I think is extremely advisable, and provides 1 hour general debate.

Mr. Speaker, what has been said about

the admission of Alaska and Hawaii is indisputable, it is absolutely true. When new States came into the Union it has been customary, at least it was customary for many years, to increase the size of the House of Representatives. However, it is my understanding that in 1912, when the last apportionments were made, it was considered necessary to make the statement that that was going to be the total for many years to come; that more than 435 Members would be unwieldy. Now, a great many people throughout the country—and I say this is not in a spirit of merriment—believe it would be better to decrease the House of Representatives rather than to increase. So, there are two schools of thought on this whole matter. Personally, I can see a great deal of justification in saying that you should increase the size when you increase the number of States, but I would like to remind you before you get too far with this legislation that you are probably opening a Pandora's box that may well come back to plague us all. We are going to have a good many more States that I can foresee in the future. Puerto Rico is knocking at the door and will soon gain admission; I have no doubt of that. The Virgin Islands also will be admitted as a State. There are rumors that Guam is also likely to want statehood, and there may be others. For that reason the House will grow and grow if this formula is adopted.

Now, another thing I would like to point out—and, of course, this may be human nature that we deplore—why should certain States be singled out for those seats and others have to give up seats? Take my own State of New York; take 21 States on this list that are all losing. And, why are they losing? Because they did their homework, because their State legislatures met, and because they reapportioned according to population. Now, we are the ones that are left, so to speak, and these three States who did not quite do all their homework and who feel that they are aggrieved—and who, I must say, have justification. Mr. Speaker; I am not denying that—come in and get these added seats. I think we should look into this very, very carefully while we consider this legislation, while we look over the list of the affected States, and what it means to our own districts. I have every confidence that the decision of the House will be a wise one; I am not speaking against the bill in speaking on this bill. I am merely trying to point out some of the pitfalls that I can see ahead. It is so easy to give, especially to our friends—and we have many very dear friends in the House—that we do not want to see adversely affected. Nevertheless, this has deeper implications than personal friendship.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Would the gentlewoman have objected to this increase if it had been made at the time when the two new States were admitted to the union?